	Case 1:20-cv-00358-NONE-JLT Docume	ent 27 Filed 01/04/21 Page 1 of 2
1		
2		
3		
3		
5		
6		
7		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
9	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
10	EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA	
11	CHINED CADDOZAI	Cose No. 1,20 ev 00259 NONE ILT (DC)
	SHIKEB SADDOZAI,	Case No. 1:20-cv-00358-NONE-JLT (PC)
12	Plaintiff,	FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS TO DISMISS ACTION FOR FAILURE TO
13	V.	OBEY COURT ORDERS AND FAILURE TO STATE A CLAIM
14	J. CEBALLOS, et al.,	14-DAY DEADLINE
15	Defendants.	
16		
17	On May 10, 2020, the Court issued a screening order directing Plaintiff, within 21 days, to	
18	file a first amended complaint curing the deficiencies in his pleading or a notice of voluntary	
19	dismissal. (Doc. 10.) The Court cautioned Plaintiff that failure to comply with the screening order	
20	would result in a recommendation "that this action be dismissed for failure to state a claim and to	
21	obey a court order." (Id. at 8.) Although the Court has granted Plaintiff four extensions of time	
22	spanning nearly 200 days (see Docs. 13, 19, 22, 24), Plaintiff has failed to file an amended	
23	complaint or notice of voluntary dismissal within the time provided.	
24	The Local Rules, corresponding with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 11, provide,	
25	"[f]ailure of counsel or of a party to comply with any order of the Court may be grounds for	
26	the imposition by the Court of any and all sanctions within the inherent power of the Court."	
27	Local Rule 110. "District courts have inherent power to control their dockets" and, in exercising	
28	that power, may impose sanctions, including dismissal of an action. Thompson v. Housing Auth.,	

1 City of Los Angeles, 782 F.2d 829, 831 (9th Cir. 1986). A court may dismiss an action based on a 2 party's failure to prosecute an action, obey a court order, or comply with local rules. See, e.g., 3 Ferdik v. Bonzelet, 963 F.2d 1258, 1260-61 (9th Cir. 1992) (dismissal for failure to comply with a 4 court order to amend a complaint); Malone v. U.S. Postal Service, 833 F.2d 128, 130-31 (9th Cir. 5 1987) (dismissal for failure to comply with a court order); Henderson v. Duncan, 779 F.2d 1421, 6 1424 (9th Cir. 1986) (dismissal for failure to prosecute and to comply with local rules). 7 Accordingly, the Court RECOMMENDS that this action be DISMISSED for Plaintiff's 8 failure to obey court orders and failure to state a claim on which relief can be granted. These 9 Findings and Recommendations will be submitted to the United States District Judge assigned to 10 this case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within 14 days of the date of 11 service of these Findings and Recommendations, Plaintiff may file written objections with the 12 Court. The document should be captioned, "Objections to Magistrate Judge's Findings and 13 Recommendations." Plaintiff's failure to file objections within the specified time may result in 14 waiver of his rights on appeal. Wilkerson v. Wheeler, 772 F.3d 834, 839 (9th Cir. 2014) (citing 15 Baxter v. Sullivan, 923 F.2d 1391, 1394 (9th Cir. 1991)). 16 IT IS SO ORDERED. 17 Dated: **December 31, 2020** /s/ Jennifer L. Thurston 18 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

Case 1:20-cv-00358-NONE-JLT Document 27 Filed 01/04/21 Page 2 of 2

28